DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 632 HE 014 996

AUTHOR Hill, Malcolm D.
TITLE Faculty Sex Composition and Job Satisfaction Among Academic Women.
PUB DATE 20 Mar 82
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, March 20, 1982). Not available in paper copy due to marginal legibility of original.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *College Environment; *College Faculty; *Females; Higher Education; *Job Satisfaction; Males; *Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Conditions; *Women Faculty
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

The connection between faculty sex composition and job satisfaction among women academics in selected institutions of higher education in Pennsylvania was examined. Responses to a mailed questionnaire were received from 1,089 respondents, including 214 women. Biographical data and demographic information were collected, and job satisfaction was measured by a 45-item, Likert-type inventory that reflects dimensions of the work environment of higher education (economic, teaching, administrative, associational, recognition-support, and convenience facets). Women who taught in institutions with relatively high proportions of women on the faculty tended to be significantly more satisfied than those who taught in highly male-dominated institutions, on some but not all dimensions of job satisfaction. Of the six dimensions of job satisfaction, those reflecting the economic, administrative, and convenience dimensions were most affected by sex composition. The positive effects of increased proportions of women faculty are likely to be more pronounced among humanities, social and behavioral science, social service, and mathematics and physical science faculty; and among these groups the economic dimension is often the most significantly affected dimension of job satisfaction. Implications for a support network theory of job satisfaction among women faculty are considered. A bibliography is appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED215632

Faculty Sex Composition and Job Satisfaction Among Academic Women

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Malcolm D Hill

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Paper Prepared for Presentation
at the
Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
New York
March 20, 1982

By
Malcolm D. Hill
The Pennsylvania State University
Altoona Campus

HE 014 996

Abstract

The present research examines the connection between faculty sex composition and job satisfaction among women academics in selected institutions of higher education in Pennsylvania. Results of t-tests of means of six facet specific dimensions of job satisfaction for women in "highly male dominated" institutions and "less highly male dominated" institutions indicate that women in the "less highly male dominated" institutions report higher levels of job satisfaction than their colleagues in "highly male dominated" schools. Evidence suggests that of the six dimensions of job satisfaction examined, those reflecting the economic, administrative and convenience dimensions are those that are affected most by sex composition. Implications for a support network theory of job satisfaction among women faculty are considered.

With the publication of Bernard's Academic Women (1964) female academics have become the focus of considerable research. In fact, during the past two decades literature on female academics has become so extensive that sizeable bibliographies have been published to aid the researcher (Moore, 1980). A review of this literature seems to suggest that almost every subject pertinent to these women has been investigated at one time or another. Yet even the most casual observer could not help but notice that one topic seems to have been almost totally ignored: Job satisfaction among women college professors. This gap in the literature seems peculiarly at odds with current concerns over affirmative action, the women's movement, and the disadvantaged status of academic women in the United States (Freeman, 1977). It therefore seems appropriate that an attempt be made to shed some light on this issue.

Previous research on job satisfaction among college faculty suggests that job dissatisfaction is likely to be associated with a number of demographic characteristics. Those mentioned by Kemerer and Baldridge (1975) include rank, age and degree level of faculty members. Other writers suggest that dissatisfied faculty are more likely to be found among those who are young, those who occupy low rank, and those who teach in the humanities, social and behavioral sciences (Feuille and Blandin, 1976; Ladd and Lipset, 1973; Seidman, Kelley and Edge, 1974). These same writers also suggest that men more often than women

express dissatisfaction with their work in higher education. Unfortunately so little research has been done on sex differences and job satisfaction among college faculty that no firm conclusions can be drawn. One of the very few studies which has dealt with this specific issue indicates that the general level of job satisfaction of female academics is lower than that of men and that lower rates of job involvement and participation in decision making compliment this pattern (Hollon and Gemmill, 1976). For additional clues on job satisfaction among professional women one must look outside academe. Related research on other types of professional women offers mixed results. Some studies indicate that women tend to be less satisfied with their rate of pay, promotion, and their over all jobs than their male counterparts (Shapiro and Wahba, 1973; Weaver, 1974; Peck, 1936). Among social workers there is some evidence that suggests that while women are significantly less satisfied than men with various facets of their work, their level of job satisfaction is affected by their status within the profession (Glicken, 1977). Similarly among librarians, research indicates that women tend to be somewhat less satisfied with their work than men (Wahba, 1975). However, other studies show that women who work in clearly female dominated occupations, such as elementary school teaching, tend to be more satisfied with their jobs than male teachers (Chase, 1951). In another predominantly female profession, namely nursing, several studies indicate that although nurses may be dissatisfied with some of their working conditions they are quite satisfied with their vocation as a whole (Bressler and Kephart, 1955; Bullock, 1954). While such evidence is extremely slim to base any assumptions about the job satisfaction of female professionals, it does

seem to suggest that job satisfaction among professional women may be affected by the extent to which they dominate their particular occupation. It is a variant of this notion that the present research seeks to probe.

It appears to be a well documented fact that women academics constitute a definite minority in higher education. During the past two decades the proportion of women on college and university faculties has hovered around 20 percent. But in the more prestigious institutions and universities the percentage has been considerably lower (Carnegie Council, 1980). Many of these institutions, particularly those of the "Ivy League" group, have always been traditional male bastions. On the other hand, some colleges such as state colleges, especially those that were at one time "normal schools", and two-year community colleges have tended to have much higher proportions of women faculty. These differences in the sexual composition of higher education faculty have important consequences for women academics. It is, for example, well known that in many institutions women are not seen as serious or legitimate professional contenders in the academic enterprise. Consequently they are often relegated to the "helping" or "support" positions where they have little autonomy and limited involvement in decision making processes. At the same time, the "stag" effect also operates to exclude women from meaningful participation in the affairs of their institutions. It thus seems reasonable to expect that to the degree that men dominate particular institutions of higher education, these exclusionary and discriminatory patterns will operate more virulently. Concomitantly, it also seems reasonable to assume that in institutions where women comprise a significant segment of the faculty and enjoy the support of

numerous female colleagues, the potential for discrimination may be reduced. This in turn may enhance the level of job satisfaction among academic women. If these notions have substance, then empirical analysis should provide support for the following hypotheses:

> Women who teach in institutions with relatively high proportions of women on faculty will be more satisfied with various facets of their work than women who teach in "highly" male dominated institutions.
>
> Women in those segments of academia that are purportedly disaffected with their work -- younger faculty, those with lower degrees, those in the lower academic ranks, and those who teach in the humanities, social and behavioral sciences -- will be more satisfied with various facets of their work if they are employed in institutions with relatively high proportions of women faculty.

Methodology

In order to examine these issues empirically mailed questionnaires were sent to faculty in twenty colleges and universities in Pennsylvania. Institutions in the survey included community colleges, two-year branch campuses of a major university, state colleges, private liberal arts colleges, and two universities. Usable returns were received from 1,089 respondents including 214 women for an overall response rate of 45.5%. The data in this particular study is based on the responses of the 214 female academics.[1]

Biographical data covering a wide range of items reflecting such things as educational background, work-related activities and demographic information was collected from each respondent. Job satisfaction was measured by a 45 item, Likert type inventory which reflected various dimensions of the work environment of higher education.[2] A principal

Table 1

Items Attributed to the Various
Dimensions of Job Satisfaction

A. The Economic Dimension*
   (1) Salary
   (2) Tenure
   (3) Fringe benefits
   (4) Salary parity with other institutions
   (5) The clarity and consistency of institutional requirements for promotion, tenure, and retention
   (6) Retirement policies
   *Coefficient Alpha is .88

B. The Teaching Dimension*
   (1) Association with college age students
   (2) Teaching
   (3) Opportunities to influence young people
   (4) The academic growth of young people
   (5) The motivational level of your students
   *Coefficient Alpha is .92

C. The Administrative Dimension*
   (1) Involvement in faculty hiring and termination decisions
   (2) Involvement in campus promotion and tenure decisions
   (3) Involvement in general policy making
   (4) Involvement in extracurricular development
   *Coefficient Alpha is .87

D. The Associational Dimension*
   (1) The opportunity to associate professionally with others in your field
   (2) The opportunity to socialize with professionals
   (3) The interest which other colleagues have in your work
   (4) The co-operation of your colleagues
   *Coefficient Alpha is .84

E. The Recognition-Support Dimension*
   (1) Recognition of scholarly achievement
   (2) Support for teaching innovation
   (3) Support for research
   (4) Opportunities for research
   *Coefficient Alpha is .90

F. The Convenience Dimension*
   (1) Physical surroundings of work
   (2) Freedom from conflicting occupational demands
   (3) Amounts of work
   (4) Variety of occupational tasks
   (5) Office facilities
   *Coefficient Alpha is .89

components factor analysis of this inventory revealed the presence of six distinct factors which were subsequently identified as representing six facet-specific dimensions of job satisfaction in higher education. These dimensions included the economic, teaching, administrative, associational, recognition-support, and convenience facets of job satisfaction. Subscales of each of these dimensions was developed from items comprising the six factors; and subscale scores for each respondent were derived from the factor loadings of the respective items. Reliability of the subscales was assessed by Cronbach's (1951) coefficient alpha which revealed coefficients of .84 to .92. These subscales and the items comprising them are presented in Table 1.

Since the vast majority of the faculties of institutions of higher education are male dominated with respect to their sex composition, any definition of "highly" male dominated and "less highly" male dominated is arbitrary. As mentioned above, available data shows that the proportion of women faculty in institutions of higher education in the United States has averaged about twenty percent since the early 1960's (Freeman, 1977; Bayer and Astin, 1975).[3] Thus for purposes of the present research we have used this twenty percent figure as the criterion for dividing our sample of institutions into two groups. Those with more than twenty percent women on faculty as defined as "less highly" male dominated institutions and those with twenty percent of less as "highly" male dominated institutions. The assignment of institutions to these respective groups was based on The Pennsylvania Department of Education's published statistics detailing the sex composition of full-time teaching faculty for the institutions used in this survey (1980).[4]

Data Analysis

Differences in Job Satisfaction in Highly Male Dominated and Less Highly Male Dominated Institutions.

T-Tests of group means of the six facet-specific dimensions of job satisfaction of faculty in the two types of institutions dealt with here reveals some notable differences between women faculty. The most marked difference occurs on the economic dimension of job satisfaction where women in less highly male dominated institutions report significantly higher levels of satisfaction than their colleagues in highly male dominated settings. Less pronounced but still significant differences occur on the administrative and convenience dimensions where women academics in less highly male dominated institutions report higher levels of satisfaction than women in the second type of institution. On the three remaining dimensions -- teaching, associational, and recognition-support -- differences between the two faculty groups fail to reach significance levels. It is however interesting to note that on each of these dimensions the level of reported job satisfaction is consistently higher in institutions that have higher proportions of women on faculty. It should also be noted that if the various dimensions are ordered by levels of job satisfaction for each type of institution, women in "less highly" male dominated institutions report that economic conditions provide the highest level of satisfaction followed by teaching and convenience factors, whereas those in "highly" male dominated institutions derive the highest satisfaction from teaching and then from associational and convenience features. While these findings are certainly far from conclusive evidence they tend to provide partial support for the contention that women who

Table 2

Means of Facet-Specific Dimensions of Job Satisfaction
For Female Faculty in "Highly" and "Less Highly"
Male Dominated Institutions

Dimensions of Job Satisfaction	Type of Institution		
	"Highly" Male Dominated N = 111	"Less Highly" Male Dominated N = 103	
Teaching	4.29	4.42	N.S.
Economic	3.62	4.46	*
Administrative	3.64	4.19	**
Associational	4.04	4.19	N.S.
Recognition-Support	3.68	3.75	N.S.
Convenience	3.86	4.33	**

* Sig. at .01
** Sig. at .05

teach in "less highly" dominated institutions are more satisfied with their work situations than those employed in institutions with comparatively higher proportions of men on faculty.

Job Satisfaction and Demographic Variables

1. Disciplinary Affiliation

The data on disciplinary affiliation and job satisfaction indicates a fairly consistent and general pattern among women faculty: women with higher levels of job satisfaction tend to work in "less highly" male dominated schools. Specifically, in thirty-five of the forty-eight t-tests, statistics were in the predicted direction with women in "less highly" dominated institutions reporting higher levels of job satisfaction than their counterparts in "highly" male dominated schools. For women teaching in the humanities the difference between the two groups reached significance levels on the economic dimensions; In the social and behavioral sciences, significant differences were found in the economic and convenience dimensions; And among those in education, differences were significant on the teaching dimension. In only one other discipline was there a significant statistical difference. This occurred among natural science faculty on the economic dimension. In one field, engineering, the number of respondents was too small to permit statistical comparisons. The data seem to suggest that disciplinary affiliation does little to affect the relationship between various facets of job satisfaction and the sexual composition of an institution's faculty. It should however, be noted that while the differences reported here extend to most disciplines and to most dimen-

sions of job satisfaction, those that are most pronounced emerge on the economic, teaching, and convenience dimensions. This suggests that the effects of sex composition on women's job satisfaction are likely to be felt more strongly on these dimensions of job satisfaction for the women in the aforementioned disciplines.

2. Rank

When we examine job satisfaction by rank we find that for all but three t-tests all ranks of faculty in "less highly" male dominated schools tend to be more satisfied with their work than those in "highly" male dominated schools. These statistics would appear to indicate that sexual composition of faculty affects women at all faculty ranks in a fairly consistent way. They also suggest that for all ranks of women academics the effects of sexual composition are most accutely felt on the economic dimension where male dominancy significantly detracts from women's job satisfaction.

3. Degree Level

Analysis of faculty differences in job satisfaction by degree level indicates few if any variations from the pattern already noted. In general, women at all degree levels tend to be more satisfied on the various dimensions of job satisfaction when they teach in institutions with proportionately more women on faculty. It is also apparent from the statistics that increased female representation on faculty is likely to affect women faculty's satisfaction with economic considerations more potently than it does other dimensions. We should however point out that for women with their first professional degrees, sexual composition of faculty impinges significantly on both convenience and economic facets of job satisfaction.

4. Age

It is apparent from the statistics on age that all age groups of women faculty are likely to experience enhanced levels of job satisfaction on the various dimensions of their work situation when they work in schools with proportionately higher numbers of women of faculty. These tendencies seem to be most pronounced among the youngest age group (25-35) where sexual composition significantly affects satisfaction on the economic, associational and convenience dimensions. In the next age group (36-45) differences between the two faculty groups reaches significance levels on the economic dimension. Among the middle age group (46-55) significant differences emerge on both the economic administrative and the convenience dimensions. Only among older faculty (56-65) do the differences fail to reach significance levels.

These findings tend to support the second of our contentions, that the relationship between sexual composition of an institution's faculty and various dimensions of job satisfaction will continue to hold when we control for those demographic characteristics that are purported to affect the job satisfaction of faculty. It would seem that increased representation of women on faculty bodies enhances the job satisfaction of a wide variety of women academics.

Discussion

This study has attempted to assess the contention that women who teach in "highly" male dominated institutions of higher education will be less satisfied with various aspects of their work than thos employed in institutions that are "less highly" male dominated with respect to the composition of their faculty. In other words, it tests the assumption

Table 3

Means of Facet-Specific Dimensions of Job Satisfaction for Women Academics in Highly Male Dominated and Less Highly Male Dominated Colleges and Universities

	Teaching	Economic	Administrative	Associational	Recognition Support	Convenience
1. Disciplinary Area						
Humanities						
Highly Male Dominated	4.51	3.51	3.84	3.95	3.71	3.82
Less Highly Male Dominated	4.55	4.41**	4.01	4.24	3.95	4.20
Social & Behavioral Sciences						
Highly Male Dominated	4.35	3.26	3.44	3.75	3.81	3.84
Less Highly Male Dominated	4.97	4.71*	3.96	4.38	3.80	4.32**
Education						
Highly Male Dominated	3.55	3.74	3.46	4.01	3.54	3.84
Less Highly Male Dominated	4.70**	4.29	3.83	4.24	3.75	4.34
Math & Physical Sciences						
Highly Male Dominated	3.50	3.33	3.36	3.75	3.09	3.20
Less Highly Male Dominated	2.53	3.41	3.54	3.62	2.52	2.76
Natural Sciences						
Highly Male Dominated	5.19	4.00	4.21	4.43	4.03	4.57
Less Highly Male Dominated	3.67	5.22*	4.58	4.16	4.08	4.93
Social Service						
Highly Male Dominated	4.92	3.33	4.33	4.42	4.25	3.90
Less Highly Male Dominated	5.04	5.38	4.69	4.25	3.44	4.05
Health Services						
Highly Male Dominated	4.89	4.52	4.37	4.37	4.12	4.80
Less Highly Male Dominated	4.73	4.93	4.69	4.91	3.94	4.90
Technical Vocational						
Highly Male Dominated	5.33	4.00	3.50	3.75	4.25	4.60
Less Highly Male Dominated	4.[illegible]	4.66	4.37	3.16	4.[illegible]1	5.26

Table 3 (Continued)

	Teaching	Economic	Administrative	Associational	Recognition Support	Convenience
2. Rank						
Instructor						
Highly Male Dominated	4.51	3.46	3.19	4.21	3.75	4.25
Less Highly Male Dominated	4.55	4.33**	4.09	4.27	4.35	4.74
Assistant Professor						
Highly Male Dominated	4.77	3.61	3.76	3.91	4.07	4.27
Less Highly Male Dominated	4.58	4.75*	4.15	4.21	3.77	4.40
Associate Professor						
Highly Male Dominated	4.28	3.92	4.27	4.35	3.73	4.11
Less Highly Male Dominated	4.65	4.65**	4.37	4.61	3.97	4.33
Professor						
Highly Male Dominated	3.96	3.67	3.69	4.08	3.50	3.82
Less Highly Male Dominated	4.68	4.82**	4.00	3.93	3.82	4.67
3. Degree Level						
1st. Professional Degree						
Highly Male Dominated	4.67	3.75	3.85	4.28	3.75	4.19
Less Highly Male Dominated	4.80	4.69**	3.99	4.33	4.05	4.91**
Masters Degree						
Highly Male Dominated	4.97	4.20	4.19	4.42	4.17	4.62
Less Highly Male Dominated	4.66	4.82	4.27	4.59	3.87	4.43
Doctorate						
Highly Male Dominated	4.79	3.54	3.79	4.00	4.18	4.34
Less Highly Male Dominated	4.88	4.78*	4.33	4.19	4.21	4.68

Tabel 3 (Continued)

	Teaching	Economic	Administrative	Associational	Recognition Support	Convenience
4. Age						
25-35						
Highly Male Dominated	4.34	3.53	3.55	3.66	3.77	3.98
Less Highly Male Dominated	4.65	4.61*	3.98	4.38*	4.07	4.77*
36-45						
Highly Male Dominated	4.17	3.59	3.89	4.15	3.58	3.81
Less Highly Male Dominated	4.33	4.38**	3.90	3.76	3.46	3.88
46-55						
Highly Male Dominated	4.51	3.85	3.74	4.27	4.21	4.29
Less Highly Male Dominated	5.12	4.95*	5.12	4.48	4.36	4.99**
56-65						
Highly Male Dominated	4.27	3.67	3.86	4.36	2.86	4.09
Less Highly Male Dominated	4.20	4.23	4.16	4.55	3.72	4.30

* Sig. at .01
** Sig. at .05

that the sexual composition of the faculty of these institutions affects the job satisfaction of women academics employed by them.

Before discussing the findings some of the limitations of the study should be noted. First, the findings of this study can not be generalized to all institutions of higher education. Strictly speaking, they reflect the attitudes of women respondents in twenty institutions of higher education in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Thus the results and conclusions apply only to them. Second, it is obvious that one study conducted in one state at one point in time cannot do justice to the complex issue of job satisfaction among women faculty. It goes without saying that different conditions and situations will affect the climate of job satisfaction. In addition, it must be recognized that many variables which are highly sex linked such as marital status, tenure, salary, etc. have been left unexamined in this study. Thus this research presents a limited view of factors that may affect women academics satisfaction with their work. Also, in focusing attention on women we have neglected to examine the other side of the issue: whether sexual composition of faculty affects male academics' job satisfaction. But this aspect must be left to another time.

In spite of these limitations, the present study offers partial and limited support for the assertions that were made earlier. On the basis of these statistics we must conclude that women who teach in institutions with relatively high proportions of women academics on faculty tend to be significantly more satisfied than those who teach in "highly" male dominated institutions -- on some but not all dimensions of job satisfaction. The findings indicate that while these women <u>are</u>

more satisfied with their work, the differences in their levels of job satisfaction as compared with those of their colleagues in "highly" male dominated institutions are more pronounced on the economic, administrative and convenience dimensions of job satisfaction. It must also be noted that the most pronounced difference between the two faculty groups appears on the economic dimension. Nevertheless, the conclusion gleaned from these findings is that the sexual composition of an institution's faculty does affect the level of job satisfaction among women academics but the effects vary depending upon the specific dimension of job satisfaction being considered.

Data pertinent to the second hypothesis provides support for the contention that when we control for various demographic factors thought to be associated with job satisfaction of college and university faculty, the original relationship between faculty sex composition and job satisfaction will remain unaffected. Recall that some observers suggest that age, degree level, academic rank, and disciplinary affiliation tend to influence faculty job satisfaction. The findings reported here indicate that none of these factors seems to affect the relationship noted above. Rather, the relationship between increased proportions of women on faculty bodies and heightened job satisfaction with various aspects of work among women faculty extends across all of these factors. In this regard, the data suggest the following tendencies:

- Women faculty in all the disciplines surveyed here report higher levels of job satisfaction on various dimensions of their work when they work in schools where there are proportionately more women on faculty. While these tendencies are of a very broad and general nature, the positive effects of increased proportions of women on faculty bodies are likely to be more pronounced among humanities, social and behavioral

science, social service, and mathematics and physical science faculty; and among these groups the economic dimension is often the most significantly affected dimension of job satisfaction.

- While women in all academic ranks tend to be more satisfied if they teach in schools with a greater proportion on faculty, the effects seem to be most notable on the economic dimension of job satisfaction.

- Women in all age groups indicate that teaching in institutions with proportionately higher numbers of women academics improves satisfaction with work. These salutory effects are most evident in the economic, administrative and convenience dimensions.

- The impact of increased proportions of women on faculty bodies may be observed among women with various degree levels inasmuch as all groups report heightened job satisfaction when the employing institution is "less highly" male dominated.

The overall impression generated by these findings is that women who work in institutions where the proportion of women faculty is relatively high tend to be more satisfied with their work than women in "highly" male dominated institutions. This tendency does not extend equally to all facets of job satisfaction. It seems more pronounced on the economic, administrative and convenience dimensions. Nevertheless it should be noted that heightened satisfaction is not confined to those groups that some observers identify as disaffected. Increased representation of women on faculty bodies seems to be a factor that enhances the job satisfaction of a wide range of women academics. The implication of this is that the sexual composition of a faculty is something that affects the job satisfaction of the majority of women academics in a rather extensive manner, i.e., on a variety of facet-specific dimensions of the work situation.

The significance of the role of increased female representation on faculty bodies for the improvement of job satisfaction of women academics appears to be considerable. These results suggest that although the presence of more women on faculty may not significantly improve a woman academic's satisfaction with teaching, the quality of relationships with other faculty, or with the recognition-support she receives, they do significantly improve satisfaction with economic conditions and convenience features and promote a more positive attitude toward administrative concerns.

The explanation for these differences are probably not too difficult to establish. Where larger numbers of a minority group are present in an institution of higher education it may be more difficult for the dominant group to condone discriminatory practices. But what seems equally likely is that institutions with more women on faculty may be more committed to affirmative action programs than other institutions and may articulate this commitment in equitable hiring practices and in better treatment of women faculty. Some combination of both these things probably functions to enhance the job satisfaction of women faculty. We cannot, however, overlook the impression that when a minority becomes a significant group the legitimacy of its demands for fair and equal treatment are difficult to ignore. The larger representation of a minority in a system lends itself to the creation of a situation where the minority group members may recognize their problems and provide each other with the mutual support needed for their problems' solution. This suggests the notion of a support network of problem solving.[5] Individual attempts to deal with the disability may

prove frustrating; but where sufficient numbers permit mutual support systems to operate effectively and provide concomitant moral, psychological, and colleagial support, the problem may be somewhat more amenable to solution. The present study indicates that something of this sort may apply to the situation of women academics in colleges and universities. Earlier we contended that discriminatory treatment of women faculty prevails to the extent that male faculty dominate institutions of higher education. The data in this study strongly suggests the possibility of an opposite tendency: To the extent that women represent an increased presence on faculty bodies in institutions of higher education the objective conditions of their work situation will improve, and so too will their satisfaction with work.

The findings and conclusions presented here must be viewed as tentative. This has been an exploratory excursion into what should be seen (not facetiously) as virgin territory. Until the subject receives the attention it deserves these conclusions must remain somewhat speculative. It is however hoped that the findings will give administrators and faculty alike pause for reflection and encourage more substantive research in what is truly a seriously neglected area of inquiry.

Footnotes

1. The current research is a part of a larger survey of job satisfaction among college and university faculty conducted under the auspices of The Center for the Study of Higher Education of The Pennsylvania State University.

2. While there are well known facet-specific measures of job satisfaction in existence such as the JDI (Smith, Kendall and Hulin, 1969), they do not seem to be wholly pertinent to the work situation of college professors. Thus we developed our own index with items that seem more relevant to higher education. In developing this index we have drawn on the work and suggestions of Eckert and his associates. (See, for example, Eckert, R.E., Stecklein, J.E., and Sagan, H.B., 1959; Eckert, R.E. and Williams, H., 1972).

3. More recent data indicates that the proportion of women on college and university faculties has been increasing and may currently constitute nearly 25% of all full-time faculty. (National Center for Education Statistics, 1981). In the current study we have taken the 20% figure as an approximate average for the past twenty years.

4. These statistics which cover the same time period as that of the research indicate that some types of institutions are more heavily male dominated than others. For example, the universities surveyed here have only 17% women on faculty. By comparison community colleges have an average of 36% women faculty and state colleges 25%. All other institutions vary on an individual basis from a low of 9% to a high of 40% women faculty members.

5. As used here the concept of support network does not refer to a structured group that has regular meetings with task leaders or facilitators. Here we are referring to a situation where the individuals comprise a critical number of participants or members sufficient to produce a normative support group, i.e. one large enough to provide a nurturant socio-emotional atmosphere where the members recognize their professional self-interests and may be in a position to do something about them. What constitutes a critical number cannot be defined.

References

Bayer, A. E. and Astin, H. S. "Sex Differentials in the Academic Reward System." Science, 1975, 108, 796-802.

Bernard, Jessie, Academic Women, University Park, Pa.: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1964.

Bressler, M. and Kephart, W. Career Dynamics, Harrisburg, Pa.: Pennsylvania Nurses Association, 1955.

Bullock, R. P. What do Nurses Think of Their Profession? Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Research Foundation, 1954.

Carnegie Council. "Making Affirmative Action Work in Higher Education," in The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980, 63-78.

Chase, F. "Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching," Phi Delta Kappan, 1951, 33, 127-132.

Cronbach, L. J. "Coefficient Alpha Internal Structure Testing." Psychometrika, 1951, 69, 297-334.

Eckert, R. E., Stecklein, J. E. and Sagan, H. B. "College Faculty Members Views Their Jobs." American Association of University Professors Bulletin, 1959, 45, 513-528.

Eckert, R. E. and Williams, R. College Faculty Members View Themselves and Their Jobs. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1972.

Feuville, P. and Blandin, J. "University Faculty and Attitudinal Militancy Toward the Employment Relationship." Sociology of Education, 1976, 49, 139-145.

Freeman, B. C. "Faculty Women in the American University: Up the Down Staircase." Higher Education, 1977, 6, 165-188.

Glicken, M. D. A Regional Study of the Job Satisfaction of Social Workers. Unpublished D.S.W. dissertation, University of Utah, 1977.

Hellon, D. J. and Gemmill, G. R. "A Comparison of Female and Male Professors on Participation in Decision Making, Job Related Tension, Job Involvement and Job Satisfaction." Educational Administrative Quarterly, 1976, 12, 88-92.

Kemerer, F. R. and Baldridge, J. V. Unions on Campus. San Francisco Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Ladd, E. C. and Lipsit, S. M. Professors, Unions and American Education. Berkley: Carnegie Commission, 1973.

Moore, K. and Wollitzer, P.A. Women in Higher Education: A Contemporary Bibliography. Washington, D. C.: National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 1980.

National Center for Education Statistics. Faculty Salaries, Tenure, and Benefits 1980-81. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981.

Pennsylvania Department of Education. Our Colleges and Universities Today. Salaries and Fringe Benefits of Full-time Instructional Faculty: 1979-80, Vol. XVII, No. 7. Harrisburg, PA. 1980.

Peck, L. "A Study of the Adjustment Difficulties of a Group of Women Teachers." Journal of Educational Psychology, 1936, 27, 401-416.

Seidman, J., Kelley, L. and Edge, A. "Faculty Bargaining Comes to Hawaii." Industrial Relations, 1974, 13, 5-22.

Shapiro, H. J. and Wahba, M. "Age and Job Satisfaction of Men and Women: A Test of an Instrumentality Model." Proceedings of the Eastern Academy of Management. Philadelphia, 1973.

Wahba, S. P. "Job Satisfaction of Librarians: A Comparison Between Men and Woman." College and Research Libraries, 1975, 36, 45-51.

Weaver, C. "Sex Differences in Job Satisfaction." Business Horizons, 1974, 17, 43-49.